



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,496	05/17/2001	Viken Der Ghazarian		4835

7590 07/30/2003
OHANES DER GHAZARIAN
308 GONDOLA WAY
HENDERSON, NV 89014

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/859,496

Applicant(s)

DER GHAZARIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Nguyen

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

The response to the election requirement and the amendment filed on June 5, 2003 and July 23, 2003 have been entered. By this election and amendment, specie I (fig.2) has been elected. Claims 1-14 have been amended, claims 15-46 have been cancelled, claims 1-14 are now pending in the application.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. In the specification page 3, lines 23-26, the disclosed “There shall for,” does not seem to have a complete idea or sentence, the expression is not understood.
 - b. The specification includes several unreasonable colon, and capitalization between sentences, this make the disclosure hard to understand. For example, in page 3, line 43, the “(contrary to Herring. A pager call is sent) should be corrected to “(contrary to Herring, a pager call is sent)”. In page 5, last paragraph. In page 24, line 5 “. Which is used to receive data. Log in parking and space location information”.
 - c. In the specification page 4, lines 25-26, the disclosed “The system comprises for detecting in real time ...” does not seems to have complete idea. It is not clear what elements the system should comprise.

Art Unit: 3661

- d. In the specification page 9, line 1-2, the disclosed “Upon vehicle ignition is system is turned off” should be corrected to “Upon vehicle ignition is turned off”.
 - e. In the specification page 13, lines 14-12, the FIG. B, C, D, B does not refer to specific figure number. Those elements should be corrected to FIG 5B, FIG 5C, etc.
2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 3, and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. In claim 1, line 10, the claimed “were” should be corrected to “wherein”.
 - b. In claim 3, line 10, the claimed “slots” should be corrected to “slot”.
 - c. In claim 8, line 3, the claimed “a particular unit, Said” should be corrected to “a particular unit, *said*”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

Art Unit: 3661

art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (US 6,246,337) in view of Hiroaki (JP 10-260241) and further in view of Hall et al (US 6,424,837).

As per claim 1, 4-5, Rosenberg teaches an electronic monitoring system which comprises: a vehicle unit for transmitting and receiving a signal to a base station, and a base station for receiving the signal containing information of a parking slot and the vehicle (col.7, lines 22-50, lines 64-67; col.8, lines 24-36, lines 52-60; col.14, lines 32-56). Rosenberg does not teach including a parking space unit at a particular parking slot, and transmitting low power signal to the parking space units. However, Rosenberg teaches a wide selection of the vehicle units, and also teaches transmitting vehicle identification signal to the intermediate transceiver, the intermediate transceiver will transmit the information to the base station (col.3, lines 23-31; col.14, lines 38-52), further, Hall teaches a known low power transmission between a station and a mobile device (col.3, lines 51-67), and Hiroaki teaches including a transceiver to the parking station (para [0027]-[0031]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the intermediate transceiver of Rosenberg to each parking lot in order to facilitate detecting the location of the parking lot without having to look for the location of the parking lot in a look up table.

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 2-3, office notice is taken that including a processor, memory, power supply, receiver, transmitter to the vehicle unit or the parking space unit would have been well known. Further, Hall teaches transmitting RF signals between a mobile device and a station (col.3, lines 51-67).

As per claim 6-10, refer to claim 1 above. Further, transmitting signals from a predetermined distance to ensure reception of the signal would have been well known.

As per claim 11-14, office notice is taken that transmitting Rf optical unidirectional, and electromagnetic signal from a remote device to a reception station would have been well known. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate methods of transmission of signals depending on the range of the signals intended to be transmitting between devices and the distance between devices, since selecting a known type of signal transmission to be suitable to an application requires only routine skill in the art.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 3661

(703) 305-7687, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(703) 305-7687 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park V, 2451 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner
should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9130. The examiner
can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, William Cuchlinski, can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone number for
this Group is (703)305-7687 .

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1111.



Thu Nguyen

July 26, 2003